

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/807,280	SASAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner A. Dexter Tugbang	Art Unit 3729	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) A. Dexter Tugbang, Examiner. (3) _____

(2) J. Adam Neff, for Applicant(s). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 16 April 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Potential 112, 1st paragraph, new matter

Claims discussed:

1 and 4

Prior art documents discussed:

of record

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

A. DEXTER TUGBANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In the applicant(s) response filed on February 28, 2007, the Examiner urged applicant(s) that the amendment to Claim 1, specifically the phrase of "at the same time" (lines 12-13) appeared to raise new matter, which would then warrant a rejection under 112, first paragraph. The examiner noted that the specification was not clear as to whether or not the second magnetic pole layer and the gap layer were both etched as the same time.

However, the examiner proposed a change to Claim 1 to remove these limitations from Claim 1, as well as clarify that a portion of the gap layer is what is removed. Furthermore, a minor change to Claim 4 was needed to correct a mere informality with the language.

The applicant(s) have agreed to all of the above changes, which are in the attached Examiner's Amendment, and now places the application in condition for allowance..